

### REMARKS

Claims 50, 54, 55, 57, 58, and 59 have been amended, and claim 56 has been cancelled without prejudice. (Claims 1-49, 60-324, and 346-374 were previously cancelled.) Claims 50-55, 57-59, and 325-345 are now pending in the application. Applicants respectfully request reexamination and reconsideration of the application in light of the amendments and the following remarks.

As an initial matter, Applicants traverse the withdrawal of claims 325-345 as drawn to a non-elected invention. Applicants note that the Restriction requirement dated April 10, 2002 identified "contact configuration species" a-p and "mounting configuration species" 1-59. No explanation or definition of "contact configuration" or "mounting configuration" was given in the Restriction. In responding without traverse, Applicants expressly stated that they understood "contact configuration" to refer to the shape of the contact and "mounting configuration" to refer to the manner in which the contact is mounted to the substrate. The PTO has not indicated that Applicants understanding of those terms as used in the Restriction is incorrect.

As the mounting configuration species, Applicants elected Figure 5F. As stated in the specification, the exemplary manner of mounting shown in Figure 5F is a wire stem 530 with one end 502a bonded to a terminal 512. (See the specification, page 100, lines 4-11.) As stated in the Election, none of claims 325-345 is limited to any particular manner of mounting; rather, claims 352-345 cover a manner of mounting in which one end of a wire stem 530 is bonded to a terminal 512 as well as other manners of mounting. (Note that, as stated in the Election, claims 325-345 are generic to all of the "mounting configuration" species identified in the Restriction.) Therefore, claims 325-345 should not be withdrawn from consideration but should be examined on the merits.

If the PTO persists in withdrawing claims 325-345, Applicants respectfully request a complete explanation of the Restriction requirement. At a minimum, Applicants request clear and complete definitions of "contact configuration species" and "mounting configuration species"; a description of each of the contact configuration species a through p with an explanation as to how each of species a through p differs patentably one from another; and a description of each of the mounting configuration species 1 through 59 with an explanation as to how each of species 1 through 59 differs patentably one from another. Without such

explanations, Applicants will not know how to apply the Restriction to the pending claims or future claims brought in this application.

The drawings have been objected to on two grounds: (1) sectional views are allegedly not cross hatched properly, and (2) an example of the second component recited in claim 50 is allegedly not shown in the drawings. Applicants respectfully traverse both grounds and request that the objection to the drawings be withdrawn.

Addressing the first ground of objection to the drawings, Applicants believe that the cross-hatching patterns shown on page 600-81 of the MPEP are optional—not mandatory. See MPEP 608.02 ("The following symbols *should* be used . . .") Applicants believe that the drawings as filed are clear and unambiguous and, therefore, there is no need to change the cross-hatching of the more than fifty figures in the application. Therefore, Applicants request that the requirement to change the cross hatching of the drawings be withdrawn.

Turning next to the second ground of objection to the drawings, Applicants assert that many examples of a second component, as recited in claim 50 are shown in the drawings. As just one example, Figure 6A shows first and second components 622 and 606. Applicants note that the Restriction requirement dated April 10, 2002 did not restrict the claims to Figure 5F itself but to the "mounting configuration" illustrated in Figure 5F. As discussed above, Applicants understand "mounting configuration" to have its plain meaning, which is the manner in which the contact is mounted to a substrate or other entity, and neither the Restriction requirement nor the Office Action provides a contrary meaning. As discussed above, the exemplary manner of mounting shown in Figure 5F is a wire stem 530 with one end 502a bonded to a terminal 512. Figure 6A likewise shows a similar manner of mounting. (Again, note that, as stated in the Election, the claims are not limited to this or any other particular manner of mounting, and therefore are not limited to what is shown in Figures 5F or 6A or any other figure.) Therefore, the drawings do indeed illustrate an example of the second element recited in claim 50.

Applicants believe that amendments to the claims overcome the rejection of claims under 35 USC § 112, second paragraph.

Claims 50-59 have been rejected as unpatentable in view of US Patent Nos. 4,418,857 to Ainslie ("Ainslie") and 3,662,454 to Miller ("Miller"). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

Independent claim 50 now recites that the metallic coating comprises a material that is more resilient than a material that composes the elongate member. Neither Ainslie nor Miller teach or suggest such an electrical connection. Therefore, independent claim 50 and its dependent claims patentably distinguish over Ainslie and Miller.

In view of the foregoing, Applicants respectfully submit that the application is in condition for allowance. If the Examiner believes that a discussion with Applicants' attorney would be helpful, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at (925) 456-3915.

Although Applicants believe that all necessary extensions of time and fees have been provided for in papers filed with this Amendment, Applicants petition the Director for any extension of time deemed necessary for acceptance of this paper, and Applicants authorize the Director to charge any fee deemed necessary for acceptance of this paper to Deposit Account No. 50-0285 (order no. P3D4-US).

Respectfully submitted,

Date: January 27, 2003

By: 

N. Kenneth Burraston  
Registration No. 39,923

FormFactor, Inc.  
Legal Department  
2140 Research Dr.  
Livermore, CA 94550  
925-456-3915  
925-294-8147 Fax